

Assassinations Of The
20th Century - Why?

By Sherman H. Skolnick <skolnick@ameritech.net>
12-28-99

The 20th Century came to a close and those who procured political murders have not been heard from. Are there two sides to the story? If so, how far into the 21st Century will it take until we hear THEIR side articulated? And will the common people accept the explanations?

In the past, I have attended sizeable meetings of political assassination researchers. At the beginning, many of those present greeted me friendly-like, even shook hands with me. During the meetings I asked sticky questions. So, my so-called "friends" and "acquaintances" hooted me down, demanded that I be silenced by being thrown out of the covention hall. What was it that so offended them?

I asked questions about the financial explanation of political rub-outs. I wanted discussions of the economic forces FOR and AGAINST bloody deeds done. I dared, from an historical and intellectual stand-point, to ask if those who arranged political assassinations had any justification whatsoever? If so, what was it?

Those in attendance, concerned about their book and lecture contracts, suddenly looked upon me as an ENEMY. "Turn off your tape recorder, Sherman", they shouted. I came with a small audio recorder in which I plugged a "shotgun microphone", that could pick up discussions thirty feet away and more. What scared them so, that they wanted to grab my wheelchair and roll me forcefully out of the place? Was it my long-nose microphone which to tape I obviously pointed at them like a gun? I did ask my questions to the speakers in a polite voice.

At one meeting I asked Oliver Stone's chief researcher for his movie "JFK", whether the Rothschilds, friends of the Kennedy family, financed the 42 million dollar production. It ran in the Rothschild movie chain, Loew's. She glared at me. Later, when Oliver Stone himself showed up, she grabbed him by the arm, saying, "Don't talk to HIM!" Perhaps indulging me, because of my physical disability, Stone allowed me to point my mike at him as I asked a few questions and then she pulled him away.

HERE ARE SOME ITEMS NEEDED TO BE DISCUSSED:

If there were a well-educated populace to talk to, well-grounded in finance and history, and IF they would listen carefully, could those that were FOR political murder make a thoughtful, persuasive case?

Through their monopoly press, the Establishment brain-washes us daily to their point of view. On all kinds of subjects. Why could they not run documentaries setting forth THEIR JUSTIFICATION for preserving themselves through political murders? Because

WE are too stupid to understand? Because it would endanger the "powers-that-be"? What? Why? And they have to keep telling us each time, a "lone nut", a "lone assassin" did it?

THE MURDER OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY, 1963: He was interfering with the Oil Cartel. He wanted to take away the IRS trick favoring them, the oil depletion allowance. He wanted REAL MONEY, not toilet paper from the Federal Reserve, a PRIVATE money ship masquerading as the U.S. Government central bank. A handful of ruling families own the Fed and profit from their issuance of Federal Reserve note "money" disguised as the "U.S. Dollar". Contrary to the U.S. Constitution, the Federal Reserve charges interest on their paper money issuance, benefitting certain ruling families.

Kennedy was the first Catholic President of the U.S. Although labeling himself as only nominally a Catholic, he was perceived as being under the thumb of the Vatican. He violated Church Canon Law, however, by going along with the attack upon ANOTHER Catholic country, namely, Cuba. Some later explained JFK was tricked into the aborted invasion at the Bay of Pigs. Did his sin justify murder BY THE CHURCH?

The Military Brass perceived him as soft on the Soviets, as a communist-sympathizer. Those who commit treason, so the logic goes, like JFK, are to be shot, right? Others now claim Kennedy was interfering with the future of the State of Israel, justifying them in snuffing him out. The book "Final Judgment" by Michael Collins Piper lays out a purported circumstantial case Israel was implicated in the murder of JFK. The book rejects, out of hand, what others claim, however, that Nazi war criminals were involved.[As documented by the late assassination researcher, Mae Brussell.] And the book does not explain how the U.S. Secret Service, the FBI, and the CIA, being the Protestant/Catholic Establishment,---how and why these espionage entities could have covered up all this FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE JEWS.

JFK wanted to stop the war in South-East Asia, thus permitting, supposedly, the Soviet expansion to the Philippines and even to Australia, a former British prison colony. Kennedy was letting Dr. King rile up the country on racial issues. BUT OVERLOOKED: that JFK set loose in the U.S. that the era of the common man had arrived. A dangerous psychology, directly confronting the ruling families. And the ruling elite have a right, do they not, to assert their position by wiping out JFK? Fair is fair, right?

How to deal with JFK? Make an example of him. In front of numerous witnesses, blow out his brains in an open car. The media, on orders, will trumpet, a "lone assassin did it!". And then, the lone assassin is himself murdered. Thereafter, America will continue to "prosper" with the aid of the oil monopoly. Don't oil developers have a right to get rich? Old man Rockefeller, founder of the infamous Standard Oil Trust, was allowed to murder competitors, right?

Would we listen carefully to spokespersons of these interests? Why and how it was necessary, for the "public good", to blow away JFK? So that the U.S. could continue as a stable society.[Some details about the JFK murder are in the book "Farewell America" by James Hepburn. A best-seller in Europe, until recently it was not allowed to be sold by bookstores in the U.S. Censorship. I and one other person were the only ones in the 1970s to get the book into the U.S. I gave them away for small donations, at College lectures. Alas, no copies are available anymore through us.]

MURDER OF MALCOLM X, 1965: The makers and shakers of America began to perceive him an an objectional Black Messiah, steering 11-1/2 per cent of America against the rest. He had a way of pointing with his finger which seemed to scare some folks. While under total surveillance of the American CIA, he traveled to Africa and the Moslem world, urging unity among the people of color there and in the U.S. Malcolm had a blunt way of confronting the American Establishment with the ways they enriched themselves by exploiting people of color. A growing number of Afro-Americans were listening.

Preparing to start a speech in New York, Malcolm was gunned down at the meeting. The black man who bent down to examine him was actually part of a special New York secret police unit. Lone nuts were framed into prison.

America's secret political police have their ways of stopping loud-mouths. FBI, IRS, CIA-trained local police. If a host of near-violent dirty tricks does not work, well, then violence is justified. To preserve the stability of society and finance, to continue the necessary fairy tale of Constitutional rights for everyone. The White Anglo-Saxon Protestants are the majority, are they not? And from THEIR standpoint, are they not entitled to prevail against all dangerous challengers? The apparent motto against smart mouths, "Buy them or bleed them". [See my story about the reported role of Rev. Jesse Jackson in the murder of Dr. King.]

THE MURDER OF DR.MARTIN LUTHER KING, Jr.: The heads of America's secret political police, the FBI and the CIA, perceived Dr. King as a Black Messiah. Dangerous to stable society and set to make impossible demands upon the White Anglo-Saxon Protestant majority.

In their view, Dr. King was interfering with U.S. Foreign Policy. In 1967, a year before they snuffed him out, Dr. King gave a speech. He announced he intended to go to Viet Nam to tell Black GIs they should not be there murdering yellow-skinned people in someone else's civil war. In other words, inciting a black soldiers mutiny.

At that time, although only 11-1/2 per cent of the U.S. population, the blacks constituted 26 per cent of the American military in S.E. Asia and a similarly large per centage of the casualties. The view of the "powers-that-be" was to deal with the rising expectations of American blacks, "Send the blacks to the Asian jungles to die, so they don't come back". Thus eliminating the need of "equal rights", "college enrollments for blacks" and such.

Besides, the head of America's Gestapo, the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover, repeatedly falsely claimed Dr. King was a Communist, thus justifying he be murdered as a subversive.

Rev. Jesse Jackson, a reputed FBI stool pigeon all his adult life, was reportedly chosen BY THE FBI to replace Dr. King BEFORE THE FBI MURDERED KING. This choice made, according to reportedly suppressed records of the House Subcommittee on Assassinations, 1975-76. [See my story about The Murder of Dr. King, Unspoken details, and the reported role of Rev. Jesse Jackson.]

As to the secret military team as well as civilian assassins who targeted Dr. King on that fatal day in April, 1968---see the book, "Orders to Kill" by Stephen F. Pepper. The book became the basis for the Memphis jury verdict in 1999, that there WAS a conspiracy to assassinate Dr. King.

But the question remains: could those in favor of the murder, make out a persuasive case that it was necessary for the stability of the U.S. and to preserve U.S. foreign policy and prevent a possible mutiny by black soldiers?

MURDER OF ROBERT F. KENNEDY, 1968: He had a way of charming the underdogs of America, endangering the ruling elite. In 1967, he set off a scandal by identifying ruling families aiding dirty tricks of the American CIA through Foundation fronts. [See New York Times Index for 1967, summarizing the CIA Foundation mess. We followed up on that showing such foundations financed provocateurs to try to discredit the Viet Nam Peace Movement. Hillary Rodham Clinton became the board chairman of such a Foundation in 1990, the New World Foundation.]

Although silent about the murder of his brother John (1963), and the attempted murder by a sabotage plane crash of brother Teddy (1964), Bobby in his heart of hearts obviously vowed revenge. A natural feeling. If elected President, Bobby would get to the bottom of those who bloodied his family. A few moments after he won the crucial California Presidential Primary, June, 1968, Bobby was gunned down. The press whores, on signal proclaimed a "lone nut did it, Sirhan Sirhan". Yet the local coroner later testified the fatal bullets were shot a few inches away from Bobby's head. Sirhan was never closer than 8 feet. The documentary movie "The Second Gun" by Theodore Charach, an eyewitness, was suppressed and bottled up for many years.

[Among the corrupt, CIA-trained Los Angeles police that covered up the RFK murder, were some of the same ones that framed O.J. Simpson for a double murder.]

The arrangers of an assassination researcher convention, in Chicago, 1993, did two things that greatly puzzled me:

[1] They said they are inviting the mass media to a press conference. I said I would right there at the convention confront the press fakers to their face with their lies about "lone assassin". "If you do that, Sherman, I intend to call the police and have you arrested", so threatened the marketing expert who came up with big bucks to arrange that convention

and supervise it. I wanted to attend the rest of the meeting, so I relented. I asked myself repeatedly, "Who ARE these people with the deep pockets arranging these assassination research conventions? Are they performing a test, to see if the public is really interested in all this?"

And [2] They told me to inform my friend, Theodore Charach (His movie "The Second Gun"), that if he shows up for the meetings, he will be arrested. I was told, "Charach talks too loud". I protested in vain, "He has an interesting documentary to show". The blunt reply from the convention boss, "I repeat, Sherman, if you arrange to have Charach come here, you and he will both be arrested."

I got into big trouble when I joined with another convention participant and began investigating who set up the assassination research convention in Chicago.

So, somewhere in the 21st Century, are those who procured these political murders, going to make a persuasive case that the bloody deeds were essential to the survival of the United States as a stable society? And would the common people somehow be brainwashed into accepting these justifications?

As to the sabotaged plane crash used to murder John F. Kennedy, Jr., see my four part series: "What Happened to America's Golden Boy" and study the establishment rationale for it.